

HÖLDER ESTIMATES FOR THE NONCOMMUTATIVE MAZUR MAPS

ÉRIC RICARD

ABSTRACT. For any von Neumann algebra \mathcal{M} , the noncommutative Mazur map $M_{p,q}$ from $L_p(\mathcal{M})$ to $L_q(\mathcal{M})$ with $1 \leq p, q < \infty$ is defined by $f \mapsto f|f|^{\frac{p-q}{q}}$. In analogy with the commutative case, we gather estimates showing that $M_{p,q}$ is $\min\{\frac{p}{q}, 1\}$ -Hölder on balls.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the integration theory, the Mazur map $M_{p,q}$ from $L_p(\Omega)$ to $L_q(\Omega)$ is defined by $f \mapsto f|f|^{\frac{p-q}{q}}$. It is an easy exercise to check that it is $\min\{\frac{p}{q}, 1\}$ -Hölder. These maps also make sense in the noncommutative L_p -setting for which one should expect a similar behavior. We refer to [8] for the definitions of L_p -spaces for semifinite von Neumann algebras or more general ones. Having a quantitative result on Mazur maps may be useful when dealing with the structure of noncommutative L_p -spaces (see also [10]). By the way, these maps are used implicitly in the definition of L_p . It is known that $M_{p,q}$ is locally uniformly continuous in full generality (Lemma 3.2 in [10]). The lack of references for quantitative estimates motivates this note. When dealing with the Schatten classes (when $\mathcal{M} = B(\ell_2)$), some can be found in [1], more precisely $M_{p,q}$ is $\frac{p}{q}$ -Hölder when $1 < p < q$. The techniques developed there can be adapted to semifinite von Neumann algebras but can't reach the case $p = 1$. An estimate when $q = p'$ and $1 < p < \infty$ can also be found in [5]. Here we aim to give the best possible estimates especially for $p = 1$.

Theorem *Let \mathcal{M} be a von Neumann algebra, for $1 \leq p, q < \infty$, $M_{p,q}$ is $\min\{\frac{p}{q}, 1\}$ -Hölder on the unit ball of $L_p(\mathcal{M})$.*

The proofs provide a strange behaviour of the Hölder constants $c_{p,q}$ as $c_{p,q} \rightarrow \infty$ if $p < q \rightarrow 1$. This reflects the fact that the absolute value is not Lipschitz on L_1 or L_∞ but the result may hold with an absolute constant.

We follow a basic approach, showing first the results for semifinite von Neumann algebras in section 2. We start by looking at positive elements and then use some commutator or anticommutator estimates. The ideas here are inspired by [2, 6]. In section 3, we explain briefly how the Haagerup reduction technique from [7] can be used to get the theorem in full generality.

2. SEMIFINITE CASE

In this section \mathcal{M} is assumed to be semifinite with a nsf trace τ . We refer to [8] for definitions. We denote by $L_0(\mathcal{M}, \tau)$ the set of τ -measurable operators, and

$$L_p(\mathcal{M}, \tau) = \left\{ f \in L_0(\mathcal{M}, \tau) \mid \|f\|_p^p = \tau(|f|^p) < \infty \right\}.$$

We drop the reference to τ in this section.

First we focus on the Mazur maps for positive elements using some basic inequalities. The first one can be found in [4] Lemma 1.2. An alternative proof can be obtained by adapting the arguments of [2] Theorem X.1.1 to semifinite von Neumann algebras.

Lemma 2.1. *If $p \geq 1$, $0 < \theta \leq 1$, for any $x, y \in L_{\theta p}^+(\mathcal{M})$, we have*

$$\|x^\theta - y^\theta\|_p \leq \|x - y\|_{\theta p}^\theta.$$

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 46L51; 47A30.

Key words: Noncommutative L_p -spaces, Mazur maps.

Its proof relies on the fact that $s \mapsto s^\theta$ is operator monotone and has an integral representation

$$s^\theta = c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{t^\theta s}{s+t} \frac{dt}{t} \quad \text{with} \quad c_\theta = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{u^\theta}{u(1+u)} du \right)^{-1}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *If $p \geq 1$, $0 < \theta \leq 1$, for any $x, y \in L_{(1+\theta)p}^+(\mathcal{M})$, we have :*

$$\|x^{1+\theta} - y^{1+\theta}\|_p \leq 3\|x - y\|_{(1+\theta)p} \max \left\{ \|x\|_{(1+\theta)p}, \|y\|_{(1+\theta)p} \right\}^\theta.$$

Proof. By standard arguments, cutting x and y by some of their spectral projections, we may assume that τ is finite x and y are bounded and invertible to avoid differentiability issues. We use

$$s^{1+\theta} = c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \frac{t^\theta s^2}{s+t} \frac{dt}{t}.$$

On bounded and invertible elements the maps $f_t : s \mapsto \frac{s^2}{s+t} = s(s+t)^{-1}s$ are differentiable and

$$D_s f_t(\delta) = \delta(s+t)^{-1}s + s(s+t)^{-1}\delta - s(s+t)^{-1}\delta(s+t)^{-1}s.$$

Hence putting $\delta = x - y$, we get the integral representation

$$x^{1+\theta} - y^{1+\theta} = c_\theta \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta D_{y+u\delta} f_t(\delta) \frac{dt}{t} du.$$

We get, letting $g_t(s) = s(s+t)^{-1}$

$$x^{1+\theta} - y^{1+\theta} = \int_0^1 \left((y+u\delta)^\theta \delta + \delta(y+u\delta)^\theta \right) du - c_\theta \int_0^1 \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta g_t(y+u\delta) \delta g_t(y+u\delta) \frac{dt}{t} du.$$

The first term is easily handled by the Hölder inequality. When u is fixed, note that $g_t(y+u\delta)$ is an invertible positive contraction. Put

$$\gamma^2 = c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta g_t(y+u\delta)^2 \frac{dt}{t} \leq (y+u\delta+t)^\theta,$$

and write $g_t(y+u\delta) = v_t \gamma$ so that v_t and $y+u\delta$ commute and

$$c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta v_t^2 \frac{dt}{t} = 1.$$

Therefore the map defined on \mathcal{M} , $x \mapsto c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta v_t x v_t \frac{dt}{t} = 1$ is unital completely positive and trace preserving, hence it extends to a contraction on L_q when $1 \leq q \leq \infty$ (see [7] for instance). Applying it to $x = \gamma \delta \gamma$, we deduce

$$\left\| c_\theta \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} t^\theta g_t(y+u\delta) \delta g_t(y+u\delta) \frac{dt}{t} \right\|_p \leq \|\gamma \delta \gamma\|_p \leq \|\delta\|_{(1+\theta)p} \cdot \|\gamma\|_{\frac{2(1+\theta)p}{\theta}}^2 \leq \|\delta\|_{(1+\theta)p} \cdot \|y+u\delta\|_{(1+\theta)p}^\theta.$$

thanks to the Hölder inequality again, this is enough to get the conclusion. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let $\alpha > 1$, $p \geq 1$, for any $x, y \in L_{\alpha p}^+(\mathcal{M})$:*

$$\|x^\alpha - y^\alpha\|_p \leq 3\alpha \|x - y\|_{\alpha p} \max \left\{ \|x\|_{\alpha p}, \|y\|_{\alpha p} \right\}^{\alpha-1}.$$

Proof. When $\alpha = n \in \mathbb{N}$, the result is obvious with constant n . For the general case, put $n = [\alpha]$, so that $\alpha = n(1 + \delta)$ with $0 \leq \delta < 1$, then use the result for n and then Lemma 2.2. \square

Coming back to the Mazur map $M_{p,q}$, Corollary 2.3 says that $M_{p,q}$ is Lipschitz on the positive unit ball of $L_p(M)$ if $q < p$. On the other hand Lemma 2.1 says that it is $\frac{p}{q}$ -Hölder if $q > p$. To release the positivity assumption, we will need a couple of Lemmas but we start by reducing the problem to selfadjoint elements by a well known 2×2 -trick. .

If $x, y \in L_p(\mathcal{M})$ are in the unit ball with polar decompositions $x = u|x|$ and $y = v|y|$, we want to prove that with $\theta = \min\{\frac{p}{q}, 1\}$

$$(1) \quad \left\| u|x|^{\frac{p}{q}} - v|y|^{\frac{p}{q}} \right\|_q \leq c_{p,q} \left\| x - y \right\|_p^\theta$$

In $\mathbb{M}_2(\mathcal{M})$ equipped with the tensor trace, let

$$\tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ x^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ y^* & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

They are selfadjoint with polar decompositions

$$\tilde{x} = \tilde{u}|\tilde{x}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u \\ u^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} u|x|u^* & 0 \\ 0 & |x| \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{y} = \tilde{v}|\tilde{y}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v \\ v^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} v|y|v^* & 0 \\ 0 & |y| \end{pmatrix}.$$

The estimates for \tilde{x} and \tilde{y} implies that for x and y as

$$\tilde{u}|\tilde{x}|^{\frac{p}{q}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u|x|^{\frac{p}{q}} \\ |x|^{\frac{p}{q}}u^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{v}|\tilde{y}|^{\frac{p}{q}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v|y|^{\frac{p}{q}} \\ |y|^{\frac{p}{q}}v^* & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$\|\tilde{x} - \tilde{y}\|_p = 2^{\frac{1}{p}} \|x - y\|_p \quad \|\tilde{u}|\tilde{x}|^{\frac{p}{q}} - \tilde{v}|\tilde{y}|^{\frac{p}{q}}\|_q = 2^{\frac{1}{q}} \|u|x|^{\frac{p}{q}} - v|y|^{\frac{p}{q}}\|_q.$$

Next, we reduce the theorem to a commutator estimate by using the 2×2 -trick again. We use the commutator notation $[x, b] = xb - bx$. Put

$$\tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & y \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{b} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So that

$$\|[M_{p,q}(\tilde{x}), \tilde{b}]\|_q = \|M_{p,q}(x) - M_{p,q}(y)\|_q \quad \text{and} \quad \|[\tilde{x}, \tilde{b}]\|_p = \|x - y\|_p.$$

Lemma 2.4. *If $p \geq 1$, $0 < \theta \leq 1$ and $x \in L_p^+(\mathcal{M})$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$ then*

$$\|[x^\theta, b]\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \leq 2^\theta \|b\|_\infty^{1-\theta} \|[x, b]\|_p^\theta.$$

$$\|[x, b]\|_p \leq \frac{12}{\theta} \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \|[x^\theta, b]\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}.$$

Proof. We start by the first inequality. We may assume $\|b\|_\infty = 1$ by homogeneity. Using the 2×2 -trick with

$$\tilde{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 0 & x \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{b} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ b^* & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we may assume $b = b^*$ (without losing on the constant).

Next, as $b = b^*$, we may use the Cayley transform defined by

$$u = (b - i)(b + i)^{-1}, \quad b = 2i(1 - u)^{-1} - i.$$

Clearly u is unitary and functional calculus gives that $\|(1 - u)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. We have, using Lemma 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} \|[x^\theta, b]\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} &\leq 2 \|x^\theta(1 - u)^{-1} - (1 - u)^{-1}x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \\ &\leq 2 \|(1 - u)^{-1}\|_\infty^2 \|x^\theta(1 - u) - (1 - u)x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \\ &\leq \|u^*x^\theta u - x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \\ &\leq \|xu - ux\|_p^\theta \\ &\leq \|(b + i)^{-1}\|_\infty^{2\theta} \|(b + i)x(b - i) - (b - i)x(b + i)\|_p^\theta \\ &\leq 2^\theta \|xb - bx\|_p^\theta. \end{aligned}$$

For the second one, we proceed similarly using Lemma 2.3. □

Lemma 2.5. *If $p \geq 1$, $0 < \theta \leq 1$, there are constant C and C_t ($t > 1$) so that for any $x, y \in L_p^+(\mathcal{M})$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$ then*

$$\|x^\theta b + by^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \leq C_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \|b\|_\infty^{1-\theta} \|xb + by\|_p^\theta.$$

$$\|xb + by\|_p \leq C \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \|x^\theta b + by^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}.$$

Proof. Using the 2×2 -trick, we may assume $x = y$. Moreover we may assume that \mathcal{M} is finite and x is in \mathcal{M} and invertible. Indeed, let $e_n = 1_{(\frac{1}{n}, n)}(x)$ and $e_n^\perp = 1 - e_n$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|xb + bx\|_p &\sim \|xe_n be_n + e_n be_n x\|_p + \|e_n x be_n^\perp\|_p + \|e_n^\perp b x e_n\|_p + \|e_n^\perp (xb + bx) e_n^\perp\|_p \\ \|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} &\sim \|x^\theta e_n be_n + e_n be_n x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} + \|e_n x^\theta be_n^\perp\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} + \|e_n^\perp b x^\theta e_n\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} + \|e_n^\perp (x^\theta b + b x^\theta) e_n^\perp\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

If we apply the result in $e_n \mathcal{M} e_n$ where $x e_n \in e_n \mathcal{M} e_n$ is invertible, we get control for the first terms. For the 2 middle terms this is clear by interpolation as $\|e_n x^\theta be_n^\perp\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \leq \|e_n x be_n^\perp\|_p^\theta \|b\|_\infty^{1-\theta}$ and $\|e_n x be_n^\perp\|_p \leq \|e_n x^\theta be_n^\perp\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \|e_n x\|_p^{1-\theta}$. And finally, the last two terms go to 0 with $n \rightarrow \infty$.

We will use techniques from [11] based on Schur multipliers estimates and interpolation. We use M_{cb} for the completely bounded norm of a Schur multiplier on $\mathbb{B}(\ell_2)$. By an obvious approximation, we may also assume that x has a finite spectrum. Let $(\lambda_i)_{i=1\dots n}$ be the spectrum of x with associated projections $(p_i)_{i=1\dots n}$. We start by the second inequality. For any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the matrix $\left(\frac{\lambda_i^\alpha \lambda_j^{1-\alpha} + \lambda_i^{1-\alpha} \lambda_j^\alpha}{\lambda_i + \lambda_j} \right)_{i,j}$ defines a unital completely positive Schur multiplier on $\mathbb{B}(\ell_2^n)$, see the computation in Corollary 2.5 in [11]. As above, this implies that

$$\|x^{1-\alpha} b x^\alpha + x^\alpha b x^{1-\alpha}\|_p \leq \|xb + bx\|_p.$$

We use

$$xb + bx = x^{1-\theta}(x^\theta b + b x^\theta) + (x^\theta b + b x^\theta)x^{1-\theta} - (x^{1-\theta} b x^\theta + x^\theta b x^{1-\theta}).$$

Assume $\theta \geq \frac{1}{3}$, by the Hölder inequality

$$\|xb + bx\|_p \leq \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \left(2 \|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} + \left\| x^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} b x^{\frac{3\theta-1}{2}} + x^{\frac{3\theta-1}{2}} b x^{\frac{1-\theta}{2}} \right\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \right)$$

Using the above argument with $\alpha = \frac{1-\theta}{2}$:

$$\|xb + bx\|_p \leq C \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}.$$

When $\theta < \frac{1}{3}$, we use

$$\|x^{1-\theta} b x^\theta + x^\theta b x^{1-\theta}\|_p \leq 2 \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \left\| x^{\frac{\theta}{2}} b x^{\frac{\theta}{2}} \right\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}.$$

And one corrects with a Schur multiplier of the form $\left(\frac{\sqrt{\mu_i \mu_j}}{\mu_i + \mu_j} \right)_{i,j}$ which has norm 1 (see [11]) to get

$$\|x^{1-\theta} b x^\theta + x^\theta b x^{1-\theta}\|_p \leq 2 \|x\|_p^{1-\theta} \|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}}.$$

For the first inequality, the result is then a particular case of the main theorem of [11]. The latter says the Banach spaces defined by norms $\|b\|_{L_q(x^\alpha)} = \|x^\alpha b + b x^\alpha\|_q$ interpolate, so that $L_{\frac{p}{\theta}}(x^\theta) = (L_\infty(x^0), L_p(x))_\theta$. As a corollary,

$$\|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \leq C_{\frac{p}{\theta}} \|b\|_\infty^{1-\theta} \|xb + bx\|_p^\theta.$$

To avoid the use of [11] we provide an alternate proof of the latter inequality with a better constant only when $p = 1$ and $\theta \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Assuming $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$, we use the Jensen's inequality from [3] for the convex function $x \mapsto x^{\frac{1}{2\theta}}$ (for us it follows easily from the operator convexity of x^α for $\alpha \in [1, 2]$ and an iteration argument):

$$\begin{aligned} \|x^\theta b + b x^\theta\|_{\frac{1}{\theta}}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \left(\|x^\theta b\|_{\frac{1}{\theta}}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} + \|b x^\theta\|_{\frac{1}{\theta}}^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \right) \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \tau \left((b^* x^{2\theta} b)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} + (b x^{2\theta} b^*)^{\frac{1}{2\theta}} \right) \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \tau \left(b^* x b + b x b^* \right) \\ &\leq 2^{\frac{1}{\theta}} \|xb + bx\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 2.6. *There is an absolute constant $C > 0$ and constants C_t ($t > 1$) so that :*

- If $q > p \geq 1$, and $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M})$, $x = x^*$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$ then

$$(2) \quad \left\| [M_{p,q}(x), b] \right\|_q \leq C_q \|b\|_\infty^{1-\frac{p}{q}} \|[x, b]\|_p^{\frac{p}{q}}.$$

- If $p > q \geq 1$, and $x \in L_p(\mathcal{M})$, $x = x^*$ and $b \in \mathcal{M}$ then

$$(3) \quad \left\| [M_{p,q}(x), b] \right\|_q \leq C \frac{p}{q} \|x\|_p^{\frac{p}{q}-1} \|[x, b]\|_p.$$

Proof. For (2), write $e_+ = 1_{[0,\infty)}(x)$ and $e_- = 1_{(-\infty,0)}(x)$ and put $b_{\pm,\pm} = e_{\pm} b e_{\pm}$. So that

$$[M_{p,q}(x), b] = [x_+^{\frac{p}{q}}, b_{+,+}] - [x_-^{\frac{p}{q}}, b_{-,-}] + (x_+^{\frac{p}{q}} b_{+,-} + b_{+,-} x_-^{\frac{p}{q}}) - (x_-^{\frac{p}{q}} b_{-,+} + b_{-,+} x_+^{\frac{p}{q}}).$$

We can apply either Lemma 2.4 or 2.5 to each term. In any case, the upper bound we get is smaller than the right side of (2).

A similar argument works for (3). \square

Remark 2.7. The techniques developed here work if one replaces $M_{p,q}$ by any function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. With such a general function f , 2.6 boils down to the boundedness of some Schur multipliers on $S_p[L_p(\mathcal{M})]$ (by the discretization from [11]), this is the argument of [6]. This also explains why the results of [6, 1, 9] remain true for semifinite von Neumann algebras.

3. GENERAL CASE

In the general case, we use the Haagerup definition of L_p -spaces [12] and the Haagerup reduction technique from [7] (see [4] for extension from states to weights). As the construction is very technical, we only give a sketch to keep the paper short. Let \mathcal{M} be a general von Neumann algebra with a fixed faithful normal semifinite weight φ (we use the classical notation $\mathbf{n}_\varphi, \mathbf{m}_\varphi, \dots$ for constructions associated to φ). As usual σ^φ denotes the automorphisms group of φ . We let $\hat{\mathcal{M}} = M \rtimes_{\sigma^\varphi} \mathbb{R}$ be the core of \mathcal{M} . It is a semifinite von Neumann algebra with a distinguished trace τ such that $\tau \circ \hat{\sigma}_s = e^{-s} \tau$ where $\hat{\sigma}$ is the dual action of \mathbb{R} on $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$. The definition is then

$$L_p^\varphi(\mathcal{M}) = \left\{ f \in L_0(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, \tau) \mid \hat{\sigma}_s(x) = e^{-\frac{s}{p}} x \right\}.$$

Then $L_1^\varphi(\mathcal{M})$ is order isometric to M_* and the evaluation at 1 is denoted by tr . The L_p^φ norm is given by $\|x\|_p^p = \text{tr}|x|^p$. We also denote by D_φ the Radon-Nykodym derivative of the dual weight $\hat{\varphi}$ with respect to τ .

These L_p^φ spaces are disjoint and the norm topology coincide with the measure topology of $L_0(\hat{\mathcal{M}}, \tau)$ (Proposition 26 in [12]). The construction does not depend on the choice of φ up to *-topological isomorphisms (see below) so that we may drop the superscript φ when no confusion can arise.

The Haagerup reduction theorem is (see Theorem 2.1 in [7] or Theorem 7.1 in [4]):

Theorem 3.1. *For any (\mathcal{M}, φ) there is a bigger von Neumann algebra $(\mathcal{R}, \tilde{\varphi})$ where $\tilde{\varphi}$ a nfs weight extending φ , a family a_n in the center of the centralizer of $\tilde{\varphi}$ so that*

- i) *There is a conditional expectation $\mathcal{E} : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ such that*

$$\varphi \circ \mathcal{E} = \tilde{\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E} \circ \sigma_s^{\tilde{\varphi}} = \sigma_s^\varphi \circ \mathcal{E} \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- ii) *The centralizer \mathcal{R}_n of $\varphi_n(\cdot) = \tilde{\varphi}(e^{-a_n} \cdot)$ is semifinite for all $n \geq 1$ (with trace φ_n).*

- iii) *There exists conditional expectations $\mathcal{E}_n : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_n$ such that*

$$\tilde{\varphi} \circ \mathcal{E}_n = \tilde{\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_n \circ \sigma_s^{\tilde{\varphi}} = \sigma_s^{\tilde{\varphi}} \circ \mathcal{E}_n \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathbb{R}.$$

- iv) *$\mathcal{E}_n(x) \rightarrow x$ σ -strongly for $x \in \mathbf{n}_{\tilde{\varphi}}$ and $\bigcup_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{R}_n$ is σ -strongly dense in \mathcal{R} .*

The modular conditions for the conditional expectations imply that we can view $L_p(\mathcal{M})$ and $L_p(\mathcal{R}_n)$ as subspaces of $L_p(\mathcal{R})$ and there are extensions:

$$\mathcal{E}^p : L_p(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{M}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_n^p : L_p(\mathcal{R}) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{R}_n).$$

Moreover from iv), for any $x \in L_p(\mathcal{R})$ ($1 \leq p < \infty$) we have (see Lemma 7.3 in [4] for instance):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{E}_n^p(x) - x\|_p = 0.$$

Now we make explicit the independence of $L_p(\mathcal{R}_n)$ relative the choice of the weight. Considering \mathcal{R}_n with φ_n or $\tilde{\varphi}_n$ gives two constructions, the corresponding spaces of measurable operators $N_{\varphi_n} = L_0(\mathcal{R}_n \rtimes_{\sigma^{\varphi_n}} \mathbb{R}, \tilde{\varphi}_n)$ and $N_{\tilde{\varphi}} = L_0(\mathcal{R}_n \rtimes_{\sigma^{\tilde{\varphi}}} \mathbb{R}, \tau)$ in which the L_p -spaces live. By Corollary 38 in [12], there is a topological $*$ -homomorphism $\kappa : N_{\tilde{\varphi}} \rightarrow N_{\varphi_n}$ so that $\kappa(L_p^{\tilde{\varphi}}(\mathcal{R}_n)) = L_p^{\varphi_n}(\mathcal{R}_n)$ and is isometric on L_p .

As φ_n is a trace, we know that $\mathcal{R}_n \rtimes_{\sigma^{\varphi_n}} \simeq \mathcal{R}_n \otimes L_\infty(\mathbb{R})$ and the identification $\iota_p : L_p(\mathcal{R}_n, \varphi_n) \rightarrow L_p^{\varphi_n}(\mathcal{R}_n)$ is $\iota_p(x) = x \otimes e^{\tilde{p}}$. Hence we get isometric isomorphisms $\kappa_p = \iota_p^{-1} \circ \kappa : L_p(\mathcal{R}_n) \rightarrow L_p(\mathcal{R}_n, \varphi_n)$ that are compatible with left and right multiplications by elements of \mathcal{R}_n and powers in the sense that for $1 \leq q, p < \infty$ and $x \in L_p^+(\mathcal{R}_n)$

$$(4) \quad \kappa_p(x)^{\frac{p}{q}} = \kappa_q(x^{\frac{p}{q}}).$$

One can check that κ_p is formally given by $\kappa_p(D_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{\frac{1}{2p}} x D_{\tilde{\varphi}}^{\frac{1}{2p}}) = e^{-\frac{an}{2p}} x e^{-\frac{an}{2p}}$ for $x \in \mathfrak{m}_{\varphi_n}$.

Now we can conclude to the proof of the theorem in the general case. Take x and y in $L_p(M)$, then

$$\|x - y\|_p = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\mathcal{E}_n(x) - \mathcal{E}_n(y)\|_{L_p(\mathcal{R}_n)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\kappa_p(\mathcal{E}_n(x)) - \kappa_p(\mathcal{E}_n(y))\|_{L_p(\mathcal{R}_n, \varphi_n)}.$$

By Lemma 3.2 in [10], the map $M_{p,q}$ is continuous on $N_{\tilde{\varphi}}$, thus also $L_p \rightarrow L_q$, hence

$$\|M_{p,q}(x) - M_{p,q}(y)\|_q = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\kappa_q(M_{p,q}(\mathcal{E}_n(x))) - \kappa_q(M_{p,q}(\mathcal{E}_n(y)))\|_{L_q(\mathcal{R}_n, \varphi_n)}.$$

But thanks to (4), $\kappa_q(M_{p,q}(\mathcal{E}_n(x))) = M_{p,q}(\kappa_p(\mathcal{E}_n(x)))$, so that we can use the estimate for semifinite von Neumann algebras to conclude.

In the same way, all inequalities from section 2 can be extended to arbitrary von Neumann algebras (except Remark 2.7 as one can not make sense of $f(x) \in L_q$ when $x \in L_p^{sa}$ for general functions other than powers).

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank Masato Mimura and Gilles Pisier for asking the question on the best Hölder exponents for the Mazur maps. The author is supported by ANR-2011-BS01-008-01.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. B. Aleksandrov and V. V. Peller. Functions of operators under perturbations of class \mathbf{S}_p . *J. Funct. Anal.*, 258(11):3675–3724, 2010.
- [2] Rajendra Bhatia. *Matrix analysis*, volume 169 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.
- [3] Lawrence G. Brown and Hideki Kosaki. Jensen’s inequality in semi-finite von Neumann algebras. *J. Operator Theory*, 23(1):3–19, 1990.
- [4] Martijn Capers, Javier Parcet, Mathilde Perrin, and Éric Ricard. Noncommutative De Leeuw theorems. *Preprint arXiv:1407.2449*, 2014.
- [5] Eric A. Carlen and Elliott H. Lieb. Optimal hypercontractivity for Fermi fields and related noncommutative integration inequalities. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 155(1):27–46, 1993.
- [6] E. B. Davies. Lipschitz continuity of functions of operators in the Schatten classes. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 37(1):148–157, 1988.
- [7] Uffe Haagerup, Marius Junge, and Quanhua Xu. A reduction method for noncommutative L_p -spaces and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 362(4):2125–2165, 2010.
- [8] Gilles Pisier and Quanhua Xu. Non-commutative L^p -spaces. In *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, Vol. 2, pages 1459–1517. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2003.
- [9] Denis Potapov and Fedor Sukochev. Operator-Lipschitz functions in Schatten-von Neumann classes. *Acta Math.*, 207(2):375–389, 2011.
- [10] Yves Raynaud. On ultrapowers of non commutative L_p spaces. *J. Operator Theory*, 48(1):41–68, 2002.
- [11] Éric Ricard and Quanhua Xu. Complex interpolation of weighted noncommutative L_p -spaces. *Houston J. Math.*, 37(4):1165–1179, 2011.
- [12] Marianne Terp. L^p spaces associated with von neumann algebras. *Notes, Københavns Universitets Matematiske Institut*, 1981.

LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES NICOLAS ORESME, UNIVERSITÉ DE CAEN BASSE-NORMANDIE, 14032 CAEN CEDEX, FRANCE

E-mail address: eric.ricard@unicaen.fr